Omnipantoglyph as a Universal Symbol with Dynamic Meaning: A Philosophical-Linguistic Analysis

Evan Vortepov

Non-peer-reviewed essay

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17754131

Abstract

This article presents a conceptual analysis of the Omnipantoglyph—a universal symbol with dynamic meaning capable of expressing the full spectrum of meanings depending on the context of use. The philosophical foundations of the concept are examined, along with its connections to classical theories of language and symbol (Peirce, Saussure, Cassirer), and linguistic aspects of implementation. The concept of "dynamic semantics" is introduced as a theoretical basis for understanding the functioning of the Omnipantoglyph. The article proposes an interdisciplinary approach to the problem of universal communication, integrating philosophy, linguistics, and semiotics.

1. Introduction: The Problem of Universal Language

Throughout the history of philosophy and linguistics, the problem of creating a universal language that overcomes cultural and linguistic barriers has remained one of the most relevant issues. From historical projects of creating artificial languages to contemporary research in universal grammar—the search for universal foundations of language continues (Eco, 1995). This article proposes a fundamentally new approach to this problem through the concept of the **Omnipantoglyph**—a single symbol with dynamic meaning.

The Omnipantoglyph (from Greek παντός—"all," and γλύφω—"to carve," with the addition of the prefix omni-) represents a symbol capable of expressing the full spectrum of possible meanings depending on the context of use. Unlike traditional pantoglyphs, which represent sets of universal symbols for specific concepts, the Omnipantoglyph is a single symbol whose meaning is determined exclusively by context and user intention.

As an example of a specific implementation of this concept, one can consider a symbol consisting of several interconnected elements: a circle (wholeness), a diagonal line (overcoming limitations), a central point (singularity), and rays (dissemination of meaning). This visual structure serves as an illustration of the theoretical construct of the Omnipantoglyph.

Figure 1. Example of visual implementation of the Omnipantoglyph concept

2. Philosophical Foundations of the Concept

2.1. From Peircean Semiotics to Dynamic Semantics

The concept of the Omnipantoglyph finds its origins in the semiotic theory of Charles Sanders Peirce, who distinguished three types of signs: icons, indices, and symbols (Peirce, 1931-1958). The Omnipantoglyph represents a special type of symbol that combines characteristics of all three categories:

- **Iconicity**—the visual representation contains elements referring to universal concepts (circle as a symbol of wholeness, point as center);
- **Indexicality**—connection to specific context of use;
- **Symbolicity**—conventional nature requiring interpretation.

> *"A symbol is a sign which refers to the object that it denotes by virtue of a law, usually an association of general ideas, which operates to cause the symbol to be interpreted as referring to that object."*
>
> Charles Sanders Peirce

Unlike the classical understanding of symbol in Peirce, the Omnipantoglyph represents a metasymbol—a symbol containing within itself potentially all possible symbolic meanings.

2.2. Cassirer and the Philosophy of Symbolic Forms

Ernst Cassirer in his "Philosophy of Symbolic Forms" (Cassirer, 1923-1929) considered humans as **animal symbolicum**—beings living in a world of symbols. According to Cassirer, various forms of culture (language, myth, art, science) represent different symbolic systems through which humans construct their reality.

The Omnipantoglyph can be viewed as an attempt to create a universal symbolic form capable of integrating various modes of human experience. In this sense, it represents a symbolic analogue of Kantian a priori forms of sensibility—space and time—as conditions for the possibility of any experience.

2.3. Derrida and the Deconstruction of Logocentrism

The concept of the Omnipantoglyph also resonates with Jacques Derrida's critique of logocentrism (Derrida, 1967). If traditional Western metaphysics, according to

Derrida, is based on the privileging of speech over writing (phonocentrism) and presence over absence, then the Omnipantoglyph represents an attempt to create a symbol that would not refer to any privileged signified but would contain within itself the full spectrum of possible meanings.

In this sense, the Omnipantoglyph can be viewed as a practical realization of the idea of **différance**—the infinite deferral of fixed meaning, where sense is constantly generated in the process of interpretation.

3. Linguistic Aspects of the Omnipantoglyph

3.1. From Saussurean Sign to Universal Symbol

Ferdinand de Saussure in his "Course in General Linguistics" (Saussure, 1916) defined the linguistic sign as a two-sided psychological entity consisting of the signifier (acoustic image) and the signified (concept). At the same time, Saussure emphasized the arbitrariness of the connection between signifier and signified.

The Omnipantoglyph represents a radical rethinking of this concept: instead of an arbitrary connection between a specific signifier and a specific signified, we have a universal signifier capable of connecting with any possible signified. This does not abolish the principle of arbitrariness but elevates it to a meta-level: what becomes arbitrary is not the connection between a specific signifier and signified, but the choice of interpretation of the universal signifier in a specific context.

3.2. Symbolic Architecture of the Omnipantoglyph

The visual structure of the Omnipantoglyph as a theoretical construct represents a complex semiotic system where each element carries a specific universal meaning. In specific implementations, this can be expressed through the following elements:

Circle

Wholeness, infinity, universe

Diagonal

Negation, overcoming, dialectics

Point

Singularity, source, present

Dashed line

Potentiality, uncertainty, possibility

Table 1. Semiotic elements of the Omnipantoglyph in specific implementation

3.3. Phonetic Implementation

The phonetic correlate of the Omnipantoglyph in specific implementations can be the sound [əː]—a neutral vowel present in one form or another in many world languages. This sound represents a phonetic zero—a basic element from which all other sounds of human speech can be produced.

Intonational variations in pronouncing this sound allow for the conveyance of different communicative intentions:

Phonetic form	Intonation pattern	Communicative function
[ə:]	Neutral	Statement, assertion
[ə:]?	Rising	Question, puzzlement
[ə:]!	Falling, intensified	Exclamation, emotional reaction
[ə:]~	Gradually fading	Uncertainty, continuation

4. Dynamic Semantics of the Omnipantoglyph

A key aspect of the Omnipantoglyph concept is its **dynamic semantics**—the ability of the symbol to acquire specific meaning depending on the context of use. This concept has parallels with the speech act theory of Austin (Austin, 1962) and Searle (Searle, 1969), where the meaning of an utterance is determined not only by its propositional content but also by its illocutionary force.

In the case of the Omnipantoglyph, its meaning is entirely determined by:

1. Communicative context (situation of communication);
2. Preceding discourse;
3. Intonational characteristics of pronunciation;
4. Non-verbal components of communication (gestures, facial expressions);
5. Cultural and personal background of communicators.

Thus, the Omnipantoglyph represents not so much a symbol with fixed meaning as a semantic operator whose function is to actualize meaning from context.

> *"The meaning of a word is its use in the language."*
>
> Ludwig Wittgenstein

This concept resonates with Wittgenstein's idea that the meaning of a word is determined by its use in language games (Wittgenstein, 1953). The Omnipantoglyph can be viewed as the ultimate case of this idea—a word that can be used in any language game.

5. Practical Implications and Applications

5.1. Universal Communication

The most obvious application of the Omnipantoglyph is the creation of a universal communication system that overcomes linguistic and cultural barriers. Unlike artificial languages that require learning vocabulary and grammar, the Omnipantoglyph offers a fundamentally different approach: instead of learning a system of signs—mastering the principle of interpreting a single symbol.

5.2. Cognitive Research

The study of Omnipantoglyph interpretation processes can shed light on fundamental mechanisms of human cognition. How exactly does a person extract specific meaning from a universal symbol? What cognitive processes are involved in this? Answers to these questions could contribute to cognitive science and artificial intelligence research.

5.3. Philosophical Practice

The Omnipantoglyph can be used as a tool for philosophical practice—meditation on universal themes, developing the capacity for polysemous interpretation, overcoming binary thinking. Its structure, which unites opposites (circle and diagonal, center and periphery, continuous and discontinuous), makes it an ideal object for dialectical thinking.

6. Criticism and Limitations

Like any radical concept, the theory of the Omnipantoglyph faces a number of serious objections:

1. **Problem of specificity**—can a symbol claiming to express everything express anything specific?
2. **Problem of intersubjectivity**—how to ensure identical understanding of the symbol by different people?
3. **Problem of redundancy**—is the concept redundant compared to existing communication systems?

To these objections, it can be responded that the Omnipantoglyph is not intended to replace natural languages but represents an additional communication tool, particularly valuable in situations where traditional linguistic means prove insufficient (cross-cultural communication, communication under cognitive constraints, philosophical discourse).

7. Conclusion

The concept of the Omnipantoglyph represents an original approach to the problem of universal language, integrating philosophical, linguistic, and semiotic perspectives. Unlike traditional universal language projects based on creating new sign systems, the Omnipantoglyph offers a metasystemic approach—creating a single symbol with dynamic semantics.

The philosophical foundations of the concept engage in dialogue with classical and contemporary philosophical theories—from Peircean semiotics to Derridean deconstruction. Linguistic analysis shows the compatibility of the concept with fundamental principles of linguistics, such as the arbitrariness of the sign and contextual determination of meaning.

The practical value of the Omnipantoglyph lies in its potential as a tool for universal communication, cognitive research, and philosophical practice. Despite existing limitations and objections, the concept opens new perspectives for interdisciplinary research into problems of meaning, communication, and universality.

Further research should be directed toward empirical testing of the Omnipantoglyph's effectiveness in various communicative contexts, development of methodology for its use, and study of cognitive processes associated with its interpretation.

References

Austin, J. L. (1962). How to Do Things with Words. Oxford University Press.

Cassirer, E. (1923-1929). Philosophie der symbolischen Formen. Bruno Cassirer.

Derrida, J. (1967). De la grammatologie. Les Éditions de Minuit.

Eco, U. (1995). The Search for the Perfect Language. Blackwell.

Peirce, C. S. (1931-1958). Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce. Harvard University Press.

Saussure, F. de (1916). Cours de linguistique générale. Payot.

Searle, J. R. (1969). Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. Cambridge University Press.

Wittgenstein, L. (1953). Philosophische Untersuchungen. Blackwell.